EXHIBIT 11

1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE VICTOR HWANG, JUDGE
4	DEPARTMENT 17
5	-000-
6	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
7	CALIFORNIA,)
8	People,) CASE NO. 24000529
9	vs.)
10	OTIS MASON,)
11) Defendant.)
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
14	PRE-TRIAL HEARING
15	VOLUME 1 OF 1 - PAGES 1 - 24
16	MARCH 21, 2024
17	
18	APPEARANCES:
19	FOR THE PEOPLE: ASHLEY N. LEE, ESQ. San Francisco District
20	Attorney's Office 350 Rhode Island Street North
21	Building, Suite 400N
22	San Francisco, CA 94103
23	FOR THE DEFENDANT: CHARLES R. DICKSON, ESQ. San Francisco Public Defender
24	555 7th Street San Francisco, CA 94103
25	
26	TRANSCRIBED BY: AUBREY A. HASLOW
27	
28	



C	ase 4:22-cv-05541-JST Document 101-12 Filed 06/28/24 Page 3 01 25		2
1	INDEX - VOLUME 1 - (Pages 1 - 24)		
2	SESSIONS	D3.0E	
3	MARCH 21, 2024	PAGE	
4	MORNING SESSION AFTERNOON SESSION	3 4	
5			
6	-000-		
7			
8			
9			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	<u> </u>		

```
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, 21 MARCH 2024
 1
 2
                             MORNING SESSION
 3
                       (PROCEEDINGS IN OPEN COURT)
           (Call to order at 11:42 a.m.)
 4
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Do we have Mr. Mason?
              MR. DICKSON: Yeah. He's in custody.
 6
 7
               THE BAILIFF: I think he's going back.
              THE COURT: Oh.
 8
 9
              THE BAILIFF: Somebody walked him out the door.
10
              THE COURT: All right. We'll handle both of them at
11
    1:30, then.
12
           (Recess at 11:42 a.m., recommencing at 1:51 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



Τ	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA - THURSDAY, 21 MARCH 2024
2	AFTERNOON SESSION
3	(PROCEEDINGS IN OPEN COURT)
4	(Call to order at 1:51 p.m.)
5	MR. DICKSON: Your Honor, Charlie Dickson, public
6	defender.
7	THE COURT: Let's call the matter for the record.
8	MR. DICKSON: Yes.
9	THE COURT: This is Mr. Otis Williams (sic)
10	THE CLERK: On (indiscernible) calendar?
11	THE COURT: on our continuance calendar, lines 1
12	and 2. He's present, in custody.
13	Can we have appearances of counsel?
14	MS. LEE: Ashley Lee for the People.
15	MR. DICKSON: And Charlie Dickson, deputy public
16	defender, sir. I'm here with Mr. Mason. He stands beside me,
17	present, in custody.
18	THE COURT: All right. So I've discussed one issue,
19	which is not a it's not one of the major issues, I think,
20	in this case. But if this case is being assigned out for
21	trial today, the jury commissioner's office is asking if
22	counsel would want to waive Mr. Mason's presence for today for
23	purposes of jury hardship. There's a panel ordered for today.
24	It's not I think sufficient probably to go through the jury
25	selection process. There's going to be another panel ordered
26	for tomorrow, but it's also going to be a smaller panel. So
27	if we could combine the two panels, that would give us enough
28	jurors to probably form the venire for the pool.

If Mr. Mason wants to be present, I think that's his right. I wouldn't force him to do this. It's just if you want to do it, it might speed things up a little bit.

MR. DICKSON: One moment, Your Honor?

THE COURT: But why don't we pass that issue, because that's sort of down the line.

MR. DICKSON: Okay.

2.5

THE COURT: I'm just fronting it for --

MR. DICKSON: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- everybody to think about in the back of their mind.

So we're on for a couple of issues. One is an issue that was raised -- I don't know if it still exists -- which relates to discovery. A second issue relates to -- the Court has met with both counsel on a number of occasions today off the record and I think on the record to discuss that I was willing to reconsider Defense motion for release given that there has been some change in circumstance in that the DA's office reevaluated the charging as to the case at line 2 and dismissed a number of the charges related to that count.

The Court's primary concern in maintaining the bail on Mr. Mason was that shortly after his original release on the matter at line 1, the case ending in 0529, which is a domestic violence case, it appears that he returned to a shared residence in violation of a number of court orders. And that's why I was not willing to release him, because I wasn't sure there were any conditions under which he could be released. Now that it appears that some of the protective

orders -- or restraining orders were not served on him and the People have withdrawn those counts, the Court is willing to reconsider whether or not there are avenues by which I could release Mr. Mason but maintain public safety. I've indicated to counsel that I'm considering assertive case management supervision release, I'm considering assertive case management with GPS monitoring to enforce the stay-away order.

And so let's start with the bail issue first, and I'll start with Defense since it was Defense motion originally.

MR. DICKSON: Thank you, Your Honor. I think Mr.

Mason -- in my discussions, I think he'd be a good candidate

for release. Specifically, I would ask for OR release. I

know the Court's tentative of ACM and GPS. I think the crux

of it is he will comply with court orders. I have full faith

in that and that he'll be here in court for his trial.

And so unless the Court has other further questions, I'll submit here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think you've --

MS. LEE: Your --

THE COURT: -- said off the record that the violation of the EPO order was in part explained by the fact that he believed the EPO had expired on that date. Do you have an explanation for the remaining charge -- and I take this as argument, sort of, not facts. But related to the 166, that there was an order issued in court for him not to return to the residence.

MR. DICKSON: Your Honor, just given the pending

```
litigation, I don't think --
 1
 2
              THE COURT: I'm taking it as argument of counsel.
 3
    Like --
              MR. DICKSON:
                            Okay.
 4
              THE COURT: -- if he's violated that court order not
 5
    to go back to the residence --
 6
 7
              MR. DICKSON: Oh, I understand. So Your Honor, it's
    something that we see in a lot of cases where there's multiple
 8
 9
    orders. And individuals sometimes don't understand that, oh,
10
    there's actually two orders that are overlapping. And so when
    one order is set to expire or expires, individuals sometimes
11
12
    think, oh, man, now there's no order, not realizing there's
13
    overlapping orders. That's what I was describing in chambers.
    I've seen multiple times of that.
14
15
              I think Mr. Mason, especially after -- I'm sure the
16
    Court will admonish him thoroughly today. I've talked to him.
17
    I don't think there's going to be an issue with a violation.
18
    I think he knows he can't go back there or have any contact
19
    during the pendency of the orders, which will be in effect.
    And he's nodding his head.
20
21
              THE COURT: All right.
22
              MS. LEE: Your Honor?
23
              THE COURT: Yes, People.
24
              MS. LEE:
                       Okay. So I'm going to address the
25
    charging, because I think there's some confusion, because I
26
    was the one that charged, and I was the one that --
27
              So when I analyzed the second case, I saw two
28
    crimes: a violation of the emergency protective order and a
```

2.8

violation of the criminal protective order that was issued in the first case. San Francisco Police Department has recommendations of charges. Those are automatically inputted into the system. As DAs, we send our charges, the final charges, to our paralegals, and those are the charges that need to be on the complaint. For some reason, I was only made aware -- I only noticed that the charges that were on this complaint are charges that I did not authorize. The first charge was for a civil restraining order that the victim requested the day before the second case. I'm assuming the officer recommended that because he saw a request, and on the bottom, it clearly said, this is not an order, and there was no evidence of it being served. So that's why that was not a charge that I was going to put on.

The 368(c) charge, the officer in his opinion recommended that charge because the victim said she was scared of him and thinks about it every day, and that to him was mental suffering. I don't think -- I disagree with that charge, and I don't think that meets probable cause for that given the situation, and I also don't think that met our burden. So that's why that was dismissed.

The trespass charge, the reason why that was dismissed is because I got evidence from the Defense showing that the Defendant owns the home. And when I looked at the CALCRIM, given that, the elements are not met and he's not guilty. So I did the right thing, and I dismissed those charges. But they were not dismissed because there were no longer — it was no longer a threat. I had made this analysis

when I initially charged this case, and they shouldn't have been on there in the first place.

When I made my argument -- I understand Your Honor wasn't going to release, but I wasn't able to appear because I was in trial. I made arguments after in Department 14. It was a different judge. I forget the judge's name. And part of my argument for requesting bail was based on the initial case in which the Defendant is charged with domestic violence causing injury, 245(a), 368(c), and where he caused all those injuries to the victim because based on that, I was arguing that he was a threat to the victim's safety, especially because he came back within a week and violated not only the emergency protective order but the civil protective order in the case.

So based on the initial case, which happened less than a week prior, and the violation of the orders from the initial case, that was my basis of my request. So I understand I dismissed the case, but there's no changed circumstances in the argument that I made to the Court in which the Court made a finding that there was clear and convincing evidence that the Defendant would be a threat to the victim. So I want to clear that up.

And the argument that was made at that time by the Defense was not, oh, he was confused about two different orders. The argument was, oh, he didn't realize that the order was expired. He thought he -- or he didn't realize the order was still in effect. He thought it expired. That was the argument. Now the argument is, oh, he's confused. I

don't believe he was confused. I was there when he was served. It was explained to him by the judge. The officers explained the emergency order to him. I don't believe there is a change in circumstances.

I spoke to the victim today and told her that the Court was considering release. She is angry with the Prosecution because she feels that -- I told her that she didn't have to come to court today because I thought we were just going to get sent off to trial. And she feels like the Court releasing him may put her in the position where her life is at risk and she may have to defend herself, and she does not feel supported or protected by the court. And so she is against release. She is still in the home. The Defendant has a key to the home. There's no changed circumstances. She still believes that the Defendant is going to kill her. He told her that. There has been multiple incidents of domestic violence.

And so the People do believe there is still a safety concern and there has not been any changed circumstances, and I'm going to respectfully ask the Court to keep bail set -- or that the Defendant remains in custody.

THE COURT: All right. I'm looking at the original PSA on the domestic violence case, which shows that Mr. Mason has no arrests that I can see in San Francisco.

MS. LEE: I just want to note for the record that we did do an ICR/ACM, and it was returned, and they said he has higher needs and they couldn't provide assistance to him. So.

THE COURT: I don't see -- I don't know if your

people had a long time to look at the CII or the FBI. I don't see --

MS. LEE: No, Your Honor, I understand --

THE COURT: -- any recent convictions for violence.

MS. LEE: He doesn't. Your Honor is correct. I'm concerned with what's going on. I don't know if there's a -- the victim has said she thinks he might have schizophrenia. I don't know if he's suffering a mental break right now. I don't know what's going on right now. All I know is I have a victim who's scared, who thinks her life is in danger right now, and nothing has changed.

THE COURT: I --

MS. LEE: And so we were supposed to be on for trial, and now the Defenant's going to get released. I'm telling the Court I do believe the victim's life is in danger. I'm respectfully asking the Court to keep bail, and if the Court's not going to do that, I'm going to ask for an EM. And with that, I'll submit.

THE COURT: All right. So I see that he doesn't have any convictions for violence. The Court originally released him on the domestic violence case, which carries the bulk of the serious charges, as misdemeanors are. Then he violated the court's order, and I do understand the argument related to being confused by multiple orders being served on him.

So I am going to release him on ACM with GPS monitoring to enforce the stay-away order.

And what, Mr. Mason, that means is you're going to

meet with pre-trial today. They're going to assess you for whether classes -- it could be anger management classes, it could be counseling, it could be nothing, right? I don't know. So they're going to meet with you. Whatever they tell you to do, you have to do as a condition of your release. Before you're released tomorrow morning, you're going to be outfitted with a GPS device. I'm going to order you to abide by the terms of the stay-away order, for now to stay 150 yards away from --

And tell me the address again?

MS. LEE: It's 5 --

2.0

THE COURT: I think it's --

MS. LEE: It's 585 --

THE COURT: Arballo Drive?

MS. LEE: -- Arballo Drive, San --

THE COURT: In San Francisco.

MS. LEE: Yes.

THE COURT: 150 yards is about a block and a half, okay? So you can't go back there. Think about your house. Think about a circle of a block and a half around that area. If you go back within that area, within 150 yards, it sets off an alarm with the sheriff's department. They would come, and they would arrest you on a warrant. And then if you violate again, there's really no way for me to release you, okay? So please maintain this.

Even if you're going to take -- I don't know exactly where this is. But if you're going to be anywhere close to it, call the sheriff's department first and tell them, I'm

going to be on a bus, it goes on a route past this -
THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: The house. Give them a heads up. Make sure the device is charged, you're in contact with the sheriff's department, and don't contact the victim in any way. Don't call her, don't email her, don't respond if she contacts you, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I'm going to release you on those terms. You'll be out sometime midmorning tomorrow is what I think, okay?

And so that's the other issue I've been talking to your attorney and I raised with you, which is that I'm also going to be sending this matter out for trial.

So before I do that, let me hear the -- is there an outstanding discovery issue?

MS. LEE: So I want to be heard on that, because

Defense made a huge statement, and I wasn't here, and I was

accused of professional -- or violating orders when Defense -so there is a police report attached to the victim's

(indiscernible) that's in the discovery, that was discovered

to the Defense two months ago. This police report is later on
in the discovery. It's underneath the rap sheet, and I didn't
see it.

The Defense sent me a discovery request in January.

I responded. I gave them the discovery I had. I made more requests. I sent final emails confirming that all the discovery was sent. I didn't get a response. The Defense

didn't tell me that anything was missing.

Yesterday, after we called ready, the Defense sent me an email at 10:18 saying, there's this -- I need BWC and the photos from this report. I'm like, what? So I try to research it -- or I looked for it, and (indiscernible) find it, and I give it to them, and I didn't -- and I didn't realize that they had already had it. And then I'm trying to find the photo, so then I look through the (indiscernible). It's not there.

The police report says the photo was in the property room. So I go to HOJ in the basement, in the property room, and I have -- and I'm not even supposed to do that. It's supposed to be a DAI, but I was like, I need this for Defense counsel, and you guys have to do this for me. So they look, and they look, and they look, and they look, and they couldn't find the photo in the property room. So I told Defense counsel, I don't have it in my possession. But then I asked them, do you have any numbers of -- any other numbers or the terms that you can give me so I can -- they can -- I can find it or if doesn't exist.

I finally get connected with someone on the second call, and he was able to -- the reason why it wasn't -- even though she said it was up -- it was in the property room on the police report, it wasn't. She noted in her narrative that it was uploaded as an attachment. So because of that, it was in their internal system, and because the victim was not actually arrested for it, it wasn't something that they shared with the DA's office. So he gave it to me. Right away when

he gave it to me, I sent it to Defense counsel.

Earlier in that day, I also had sent a request to the sergeant that's in charge of sharing and looking at all the BWC to share the BWC. The officer that is the reporting officer says that she turned on her BWC, but in the actual front page, it says that there's two case numbers. I asked the sergeant about that. I said, why is there two case numbers when you're now telling me there's only one? He's like, I'm looking at the -- I have the database, and I only have one. The sergeant noted that she attached it. That's what we have, and that's what I shared with you. And he told me it would take 24 hours. I told Mr. Dickson that it would take 24 hours.

This was all before -- this was all by 1:40. He comes into Department 17, and then I'm getting text messages and I'm being told that I'm not being cooperative and things like that. I'm not being cooperative.

The information that he wants is basically an incident where a witness said that they saw the victim keying the Defendant's car. The officer came. He didn't observe that the Defendant was — that anything was keyed. He took a picture of scratches. The victim said she scratched his car. That's the incident he wants. It's not an arrest. It's not a conviction. It's not admissible. I understand he wanted it. Immediately when he asked for it, I worked for three hours, called people, asserted what I needed — my dominance to get what I needed to him, and I gave him his discovery. So there's no discovery violation because the discovery is not

being -- the discovery is not being held.

2.8

And I would just ask Your Honor that -- I am seeing what I think is a pattern and practice of some attorneys not being very clear with us about what they want or not specifically requesting what they want and waiting until we get to the jury trial, asking for it, and then saying there's a violation. If there's something that they need, anybody -- I do it. Sometimes I do it myself. I don't even go to the paralegals. So I will respond and get them their discovery.

And I would just ask that the Court -- if the Court could assist in this process and at least require that if the Defense are going to do this during the -- do this, that the rules be complied with, which is that they request these things in a timely manner so that we're not being accused of discovery violations and our character and our reputation is not being tarnished.

And so with that, I'll submit on that.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. LEE: And the People are ready. He has all his discovery.

THE COURT: Mr. Dickson, anything further on this issue?

MR. DICKSON: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. So the Court was forwarded different emails. I do have them printed. I would like -- it's not my usual practice to get the Court involved in discovery issues by forwarding emails. But since they were sent to the Court, I think I probably need to lodge them so I've got a copy printed.

I think the biggest thing is I did tell the Court that I got the photo I requested. I made that record yesterday, that I did have that item. The biggest problem that I'm hearing here -- and I know the Court I believe this week has discussed this issue in another case, constructive possession versus actual. And the photo and the body-worn was in possession of law enforcement.

To say that this incident, this 1109 incident, is not relevant is not true. The complaining witness says, I scraped the tire because I was angry. It was a vandalism to his property. It's certainly relevant. I do have the photo now. I believe the body-worn camera was discovered. But it's not timely.

And I keep hearing -- and the email that was sent to the Court and the records here today confirms an overall issue we're having, which is discovery is self-executed. And so sometimes we identify, pinpoint things like I did when I got this case transferred, took it over. I sent a pinpoint request. But it's all self-executed. I don't have the duty to ask for pinpoint discovery, and the Government has all the duty to provide it to me.

And so I think this Court should -- I would ask this Court if the Court would consider an admonishment here correcting the state of the law regarding Brady and 1054, which is not that, as it stated in the email, we meet and confer and then the Prosecution has 15 days to respond. That's the local rules for filing a motion to compel.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.



2.8

MR. DICKSON: In this case, there was a motion to compel filed as well asking for any relevant body-worn camera. And so I think the big thing I want to point out here -- I have arguments to the trial court regarding the late discovery, which I think is material. But at this stage, I would just ask -- I think the Court should admonish about Prosecution discovery duties, how they're self-executing, and how constructive versus actual possession is not a defense to not having provided it timely.

And with that, I'll submit, Your Honor. Thank you.

MS. LEE: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I'm just going to object. This has turned into an attack on the Prosecution, and I think this is something that the Court is supposed to monitor and not allow.

And I understand his argument on constructive possession. My point is follow the discovery rules, which say, send the request, do all this stuff, and don't do it at the end -- or if you're going to do it and I comply, don't make misstatements and trying to use it as a sword and not a good faith discovery argument. And so that's all I'm saying.

But I would object to the Court admonishing me. I simply --

THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to admonish.

Let me just say as a statement of law, the Prosecution's under an ongoing duty that I think you guys agree with, that anything that's exculpatory has to be turned over. That is what Mr. Dickson refers to as a self-executing obligation.

And of course, I don't know that I've seen a case where a DA's

not complying with that.

I think there's a separate question as to impeachment type materials. I think at least historically, I don't know if -- and I think I discussed this yesterday briefly. I invite any briefing on this. But historically, what was required is to turn over sort of arrests, convictions, police reports in San Francisco related to those issues. I don't know that there's a case that says anything further other than that, such as body-worn camera or evidence, has to be automatically disclosed.

Maybe there's something new. At least the way that I've practiced law for years, it's just limited to the police report, and I think that makes sense. If you want something additional, you put in the request. They should comply, and then we can look at timeliness on a case-by-case basis. I think it looks like everything has been satisfied in this case.

Mr. Dickson, I don't hear you asking for a continuance as a form of remedy. Do you want to go forward?

MR. DICKSON: I do. There's other remedies I'll be asking for in --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEE: That's fine.

MR. DICKSON: -- the trial court, but I --

THE COURT: You can reserve the remedies. The only thing I care about is whether you're asking for a continuance.

MR. DICKSON: No.

THE COURT: All right.



MR. DICKSON: No, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: So you can argue the rest of the issues 3 in terms of whether there was late discovery --And I don't hear a personal attack on you, Ms. Lee. 4 5 I think Mr. Dickson's phrasing in terms of constructive possession I think is an issue that we addressed yesterday on 6 7 a different case, was part of the Prosecution's duty is to get materials from the police agencies. That's not any fault on 8 your part, but it's just if the police hold onto it, that 9 10 they're on your team, and --MS. LEE: And I understand that. 11 12 THE COURT: -- you sort of get attributed --13 I understand that, Your Honor, and I take MS. LEE: this discovery obligation very seriously. We're not punished 14 15 for not guilty, and I pride myself in being a fair and just 16 prosecutor. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 So when they want their stuff, they're MS. LEE: 19 going to get it. My saying this has turned into a personal attack is him trying to admonish me and --20 21 THE COURT: All right. So --22 MS. LEE: -- what was happening the other day. THE COURT: I'm not admonishing. 23 24 I'm going to send you to -- both sides are ready for 25 trial now, right? 26 MS. LEE: Yes, Your Honor. MR. DICKSON: Yes. 27 THE COURT: All right. So I'm going to assign this 28



for tomorrow morning at 9:00 to Department 624, Judge Sharon 1 2 Reardon. MR. DICKSON: And Your Honor, I would ask regarding 3 the time -- I think my client might still be literally in the 4 5 release process. THE COURT: I'm going to order counsel to check 6 in --7 MR. DICKSON: Oh, yes, of course. 8 9 THE COURT: -- 624. Mr. Mason, you're ordered to 10 report to 624 as soon as you're released. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I don't know if there's a way for 12 13 you to call your lawyer as soon as you're released. The one caution I sort of have is that as you're coming into the 14 15 courthouse, you may be walking past the jurors in the case. 16 So I would just -- I don't know how to manage that. They may 17 be waiting outside. And this is the issue that I was trying 18 to --19 MR. DICKSON: Yeah. THE COURT: -- avoid happening. So let me turn to 20 21 our final issue. So just try to call your lawyer, but be 22 mindful that the jurors are going to be waiting around. 23 don't talk to anybody when you get to the civil courthouse. 24 Go straight to 624, and go inside to find your lawyer, okay? 25 MR. DICKSON: And Your Honor, would the Court be 26 able to inform Judge Reardon about -- that he's --27 THE COURT: I've told her about the timing issues.



Thank you very much, Your Honor.

MR. DICKSON:

28

```
1
    appreciate that.
 2
              THE COURT: And again, I understand that your delay
 3
    is not going to be entirely in your control. It depends on
    when you get processed out by the sheriffs. But don't
 4
 5
    dillydally after you're released. Go straight to Civic
    Center --
 6
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: -- and go to court, okay? Because --
 8
                              I will.
              THE DEFENDANT:
 9
                       So once he's released, then he should be
10
              MS. LEE:
    going straight to court?
11
              THE COURT: Tomorrow morning, he's going to be
12
13
    released --
              MS. LEE: And go straight to court?
14
15
              THE COURT: -- and go straight to court. All right.
16
              So lastly, I just raise the one issue. I don't know
17
    if parties are interested in postponing the trial by one day
18
    or agreeing to start hardship this afternoon. I don't know
19
    what they could accomplish this afternoon. That would speed
    up the trial one day. Judge Reardon said she understands,
20
21
    it's fine either way, however you want to do it.
22
              MR. DICKSON: I'd respectfully decline, Your Honor,
23
    but thank you.
24
              MS. LEE: Yeah, I'm fine with the hardship. That's
25
    fine.
26
              THE COURT:
                           They want to --
27
              MR. DICKSON: Oh, it's up --
              THE COURT: So I'll tell them not to -- to release
28
```



```
the panel today. Anyway, all right. And you're ordered to
 1
    report to 624 tomorrow for trial.
 2
 3
              MR. DICKSON: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: To be clear, since I had this issue come
 4
 5
    up on another case, I'm releasing him on both lines on the
    electronic monitoring, both lines on the ACM.
 6
 7
              MR. DICKSON: Okay.
              THE COURT: And as we discussed on a different case
 8
 9
    yesterday, I'm striking the 1035 order on the sheriff's sheet.
              MR. DICKSON: Does the Court think that's going to
10
11
    hold it up or --
12
              THE COURT: Did your other client get released?
13
              MR. DICKSON: I think he did, yeah. I know that's
14
    not -- yeah.
15
               THE COURT: All right. Let's call our next matter.
           (Proceedings adjourned at 2:20 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```



1 CERTIFICATION 2

I, AUBREY A. HASLOW, a court-approved transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 24, is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above entitled matter, to the best of my professional skills and abilities.

Aubrey A. Haslow CDLT-291 Digital Court Transcriber

antry a. Haston

April 10, 2024

~ ~